

Message (Digitally Signed)

---

**From:** Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW [danielle.janda@navy.mil]  
**Sent:** 3/24/2016 6:27:37 PM  
**To:** Bacey, Juanita@DTSC [Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov]  
**CC:** LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]; Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N [zachary.edwards@navy.mil]; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N [matthew.slack@navy.mil]  
**Subject:** RE: Review Draft Final Addendum to Parcels B and G Radiological Removal Action Completion Reports Revision 1.  
**Attachments:** BUILDING 146 AND 439 DATA PACKAGES SUMMARY\_track changes.pdf; BUILDING 130 AND 351A DATA PACKAGES SUMMARY.pdf; RTCs for Building 130 and 351A Data Packages.pdf; smime.p7s

Hi Nina,

Attached are the red-lined copies of the Building 146/439 Data Packages Summary and the Building 130/351A Data Packages Summary that demonstrates the changes planned for Appendix F in the Final Addendum to the Parcels B and G Radiological RACR. Also attached are responses to comments on the Building 130/351A data packages which will be added to Appendix I. Note that there are some formatting errors, which will be fixed for the final, however these have no impact on the substance of the text. Also, the November 5, 2015 memo for recommendations for rescans will be added to Appendix I. I did not feel it was necessary to re-send the memo, so it is not shown in the attachments.

Please do not hesitate to call me if you do not believe that the changes address comments we discussed last week. We will begin production on the Final Addendum change sheets (specifically the CDs) on Wednesday, March 30, so if there are recommended changes, please contact me before then so we can address it before document production.

I also need to request an extension for the submittal of the Final document to April 1, 2016 to allow for time for your over-the-shoulder review and final document QA.

V/r,  
Danielle Janda  
(619)524-6041

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Bacey, Juanita@DTSC [mailto:Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 15, 2016 4:49 PM  
**To:** Janda, Danielle L CIV NAVFAC SW  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] FW: Review Draft Final Addendum to Parcels B and G Radiological Removal Action Completion Reports Revision 1.

Hi Danielle,

CDPH EMB wrote a brief summary of what we discussed today in our phone meeting. I think Matt presented a good detailed explanation of each in our meeting so that your contractor should be able address each. I also, drafted my own notes, so if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thanks for arranging the meeting today. It really helped us to move forward.

Nina

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jue, Tracy (CDPH-DDWEM)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 15, 2016 3:44 PM  
**To:** Bacey, Juanita@DTSC  
**Cc:** Singh, Sheetal (CDPH-DDWEM)  
**Subject:** Review Draft Final Addendum to Parcels B and G Radiological Removal Action Completion Reports Revision 1.

Hi Nina:

We discussed this morning (March 15, 2016) by telephone conference the path forward in finalizing the document "Draft Final Addendum to Parcels B and G Radiological Removal Action Completion Reports Revision 1, Issued February 8, 2016".

During the teleconference, EMB discussed only the technical issues on the "Appendix F: 2015 Scan Data for Buildings 146/439 and 130/351A". EMB also noted from today's conference call the Navy would like to finalize the Addendum to Parcel B and G after addressing EMB's comments for Appendix F.

Please see our comments below and ensure that these are all addressed in the final document. EMB requests that redline of the final version of the document is provided for assessing that all the comments are adequately addressed.

Comments:

1. The Draft Final Addendum to Parcels B and G Radiological Removal Action Completion Reports Revision 1 is incomplete as it does not have data from Building 130 and 351A data and relevant quality control data.
2. Please incorporate EMB's memo and rescan recommendations sent on November 5, 2015 titled "Review Draft Final Addendum to Parcels B and G Radiological Removal Completion Reports", in appendix I: response to comments.

The following comments apply to Appendix F: 2015 Scan Data for buildings 146/439 and 130/351A

3. Each table and graph should have a title and be numbered. Each graph should have a table associated with the graph. In the graphs, color coding for specific instruments should be consistent from graph to graph to prevent confusion. Each section should have a unique number.
4. The thesis being presented in appendix F is that the reference area beta measurements; which was used to establish background beta count rates, fluctuates in response to temperature inversion such that there is a noticeable difference in the net beta disintegrations per minute (dpm) results between different instruments used on different dates. This theory needs to be discussed at the onset of the appendix.
5. Section: "Survey Results", page two, paragraph one, sentence eight, "All of the 2,022 investigation 2-minute statics and smears indicated that no activity existed above the release criteria." Please provide a table of the release criteria including footnotes, if any.
6. Section: "Survey Results", page two, paragraph two, sentence one, "One of the instruments used to survey in Building 439, Instrument Identification Number 972, showed higher net beta disintegrations per minute (dpm) results than the other instruments used in Building 439, though all readings from Instrument 972 were less than 1/5th of the beta criteria for Building 439." The survey type most recently mentioned in the previous paragraph alludes to, "...2- minute static surveys and smears..." Please clarify the type of survey being referred to in this sentence.
7. Section: "Survey Results", page two, paragraph two, sentence one, "One of the instruments used to survey in Building 439, Instrument Identification Number 972, showed higher net beta disintegrations per minute (dpm) results than the other instruments used in Building 439, though all readings from Instrument 972 were less than 1/5th of the beta criteria for Building 439." Please provide a table which delineates the release criteria and which shows Instrument identification Number 972's net beta disintegrations per minute (dpm) results.
8. Section: "Survey Results", page three, paragraph two, sentence two, "The higher readings are due to the fact that the background collected for this instrument was lower than the other meters used. Therefore, the conversion for counts per minute to dpm result in a higher value than instruments that had higher backgrounds." Were the background counts for the different instruments taken at identical, dedicated, and marked location, at the same time with the same orientation; ensuring that all background counts were reproducible?
9. Section, "Survey Results", 2nd paragraph, page 3, summarizes that in B439 SU4 both instrument 972 and 953 were used to complete the survey, and there is a noticeable difference in the net dpm results between the two instruments. It is not clear why background of one instrument is higher than another. What did the Navy conclude after investigating the background data?
10. Section "Survey Results", page four, paragraph one, sentence one, "However, when not accounting for background the instruments gross dpm results were comparable." Please make changes based on today's phone conference.
11. Section, "Survey Results", page four, the graphs titled, "Building 439 SU 4 - ID 953 Floor Gross Beta dpm" and, "Building 439 SU 4 - ID 972 Floor Gross Beta dpm", should be numbered and titled and share the exact same color coding for instruments as the graph labeled, "Net dpm Building 439 SU 4 Floor both instruments", on page three, which should also be titled and numbered.
12. Section: "Survey Results", page four, the graph titled, "Cumulative Frequency Gross Beta dpm Building 439 SU 4 From Both Meters 953 and 972", should be numbered and titled and share the exact same color coding for instruments as the previous graphs. The word, "Building", is misspelled.
13. Daily QC Worksheet Floor Charts, it is noted that in the column titled, "Instrument Readings (Net CPM)", the performance check for each instrument has four sections. Please explain. The column titled "Source QC Limits (CPM)" contains four separate ranges for alpha and beta readings; some values appear to be drawn directly from the Chi Square calculations submitted as part of the QA/QC records, others do not. Please explain.
14. For Data # 972; which is Ludlum Meter model 2360, Serial Number 18490: mated to Ludlum Detector model 43-37-1, Serial Number 267676: was the same check source used for both the initial assignment of background readings and also in the daily performance check background? Please explain.

If you have any questions let me know.

Thank You,  
Tracy

Tracy M Jue  
Associate Health Physicist  
State of California  
Environmental Health Branch  
1616 Capitol Ave, MS 7405  
Sacramento, CA 95899-7377  
916 324-4804  
916 449-5665 (Fax)